

CONFIDENTIAL

OFFICIAL
COPY

T/VI/M-3
20 November 1964

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD
COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION

TASK TEAM VI - RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Minutes of the Third Meeting, 17 November 1964

Members or Their Representatives Present

25X1A

DEFENSE	-	Dr. Ruth M. Davis, Chairman
CIA	-	Mr. [REDACTED]
DIA	-	Mr. [REDACTED]
NSA	-	Mr. [REDACTED]
AIR FORCE	-	Lt. Col. Waldo Bertoni
ARMY	-	Lt. Col. James L. Mylar
NAVY	-	Mr. Richard L. Bragan
	-	Mr. Marvin E. Van Dera
CSS	-	Mr. [REDACTED]

Others Present

None

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman who reviewed briefly the minutes of the last meeting and the position the Team found itself in regards to the Terms of Reference. This was for the benefit of those members who had not attended the previous meeting.
2. The Chairman asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes of the last meeting. The Air Force representative requested that the minutes reflect that project "Forecast" described generalized aspects of Air Force R&D rather than being a considerably detailed report of Air Force R&D plans. With that exception, the minutes were approved as written.
3. The Terms of Reference were considered next. After some deliberation, it was agreed that the Terms, as written were agreeable to all

CONFIDENTIAL

Group I
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification.

- 2 -

members. In view of this, the Chairman indicated that she would report to the 19 November CODIB meeting the fact that the Task Team had approved the Terms of Reference dated 3 November 1964 and that they were ready for CODIB deliberation.

4. The conversation then turned to consideration of the two taxonomies submitted by the Chairman and the CIA member, copies of which were supplied to each of the members present. The relative merits of various approaches were discussed. The role of communications was considered. The relations of R&D to requirements and the "state of the art" were deliberated. The meaning of the words "state of the art" was questioned; does it mean that which reports state it to be, the actual hardware development or is it the collective knowledge of the people in the field?

5. The discussion continued with consideration of information flow, as the basis of a possible framework. The availability, or more properly, the non-availability of the idealization of systems requirements was discussed. The results of large systems like ACSIMATIC, some Air Force I systems and others were pondered.

6. The group again centered on the methods by which the Team could attack the problem of the consideration of an appropriate framework. Three alternatives were finally presented:

- a. Have one or two members work on a specified plan,
- b. Have all members work on a plan and submit it at the next meeting for discussion, or
- c. Have each member come back with written framework suggestions based on the Chairman's outline for deliberation at the next meeting.

The concept of working by a matrix of application against source-data-type as outlined in the paper submitted by the Chairman was considered. This was compared against the possible use of the matrix of data against processes as submitted by the CIA member. After some deliberation, the group decided to build a framework on the outline submitted by the Chairman. The Chairman then suggested the following assignments:

- a. All members should add to, subdivide or subtract from the outline as desired.
- b. Additionally, the CIA, NSA and DIA representatives will present and prepare a paper based on considerations they had raised during the meeting.
- c. As a result of an indication of interest indicated by each member against the elements of application and source-data-type as outlined by the Chairman, the attached assignment/interest matrix was prepared. These indicators reflect the working group areas of responsibility to be pursued

Approved For Release 2006/04/10 : CIA-RDP80B01139A000500120016-9

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

d. Each member should prepare a list of projects that each agency has going under the appropriate sub-headings of the outline. User systems and groups should be indicated for each agency for each application. In addition, the techniques and/or procedures of handling data should be indicated based on the outline submitted by the CIA member.

e. A short listing of equipment used for each of the processes versus either source data or application should be supplied as appropriate.

f. The information developed should be sent to each of the members five days before the next meeting day if possible; if not, sufficient copies of the material should be brought to the next meeting (ten copies).

7. The R&D bibliographic effort referred to in the last minutes were considered. Some members turned in material to start this list. The Secretary was charged with preparing a consolidated list at an appropriate time. The Chairman pointed out that this bibliography should include basic documents on broad topics but not specific projects reports.

8. It was agreed that the next meeting would be held at 0930, 9 December in Room 3E119, Pentagon.

25X1A


Acting Secretary

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

WORKING GROUP ASSIGNMENTS

Working Group	CIA	NSA	NAVY	AF	DIA	ARMY
I-ABCDEIU			**			
I-CHV	**					
I-JMQRST	**	*		*	*	ST
I-K		**				
I-P	*			*	**	*
I-X					**	
I-N				**	*	*
I-L	*	**				
I-F						
I-O						
I-W						
II-ABC	*	*	**		*	
II-D	*		*	**	*	*
II-EG	*	*	*	*	*	**
II-F	**	*	*		*	

*Participation

**Chairman

CONFIDENTIAL